

Pat. App. 09/833,956

Lin-Hendel 9

REMARKS

Consideration of the amendments to the application is respectfully requested. The response is made pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.121 and 1.116. No new matter has been entered.

Status of Claims

Claims 18-37 are pending in this application.

Claims 18, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 31, 32 and 34 have been amended.

Claims**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st paragraph**

In paragraphs 3-4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 18-37 under 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner opines that it is "impossible to search simultaneously since computers operate in a linear fashion." Applicant has amended the claims to clarify that applicant's invention performs searching during a single search for all the items of interest to a consumer on a plurality of data sources.

Accordingly, in view of the amendments to the claims, the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph, should be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph

In paragraphs 5-7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd as being indefinite. Claims 18, 25, 26, and 27 have been amended to better clarify applicant's invention.

In claim 18, the word "simultaneously" have been deleted.

In claim 25, the claim limitations related to the displaying step further limit the displaying step of Claim 18 to include *displaying in a plurality of lists, the information found during the single search.*

Pat. App. 09/833,956

Lin-Hendel 9

In claim 26, the claim limitations related to the purchasing step further limit the purchasing step of Claims 18 to include *enabling the shopper to place one order for said all items or said some items of said plurality of different items.*

In claim 27, the claim limitations related to the display step has been omitted. Instead, Claim 27 provides an additional step of *enabling a user to specify display criteria wherein the information found is displayed according to the display criteria specified by the user.*

Accordingly, in view of the amendments to the claims, the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd should be withdrawn.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by
Peterson (US 6,324,522 B1)**

Regarding paragraphs 8-9 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 18-37 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Peterson (US 6,324,522 B1). Applicant has amended the claims to better clarify applicant's invention.

Applicant's Invention

Applicant recognized that searching for and purchasing items of interest on-line is a very tedious, time consuming and frustrating process. In general, the shopper must search for products one at a time or one catalog or website at a time. Applicant's invention overcomes the aforementioned problems by enabling a shopper to search for a plurality of items on a plurality of websites in a single search. The shopper specifies the items of interest to be searched and can also specify and/or exclude websites to be searched. In addition, the system searches a selectively alterable set of default websites. To use the invention, the shopper enters a list of items in response to a series of prompts. The system then searches for all of the specified items on the default sites and those

Pat. App. 09/833,956

Lin-Hendel 9

specified by the shopper. Information regarding the items retrieved as a result of the search is then displayed for viewing by the shopper. The shopper can purchase selected ones of the items in one order. (Emphasis added)

Peterson

Peterson is directed to a network for inventory control and transfer. Applicant observes that Peterson performs searches of databases and provides for product ordering. However, that is the extent of similarities between Peterson and Applicant's invention. Unlike Applicant's invention, Peterson's search criteria of an item is based on a manufacture's part no., customer part no., alternate part designates and keywords, as shown in FIGURES 9 and 15-17. Each additional "different" item must be searched one at a time. The flowcharts of FIGURES 15-17 clearly illustrate the loop back process for the one at a time search.

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Claims 18 and 34 are allowable over Peterson and the corresponding rejection under 35 USC 102(e) should be withdrawn. Since Claims 19-33 and 35-37 depend from independent Claims 1 and 18, respectively, then for the same reasons set forth above with regard to Claims 1 and 18, these dependent claims are also allowable over Peterson and the corresponding rejections under 35 USC 102(e) should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, Peterson does not teach any of the claimed limitations of the dependent claims.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by
Purcell (US 5,940,807)**

In paragraph 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 18-37 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Purcell (US 5,940,807). Applicant has amended the claims to better clarify applicant's invention.

Purcell

Purcell is directed to an inventory information exchange system whereby multiple

Pat. App. 09/833,956

Lin-Hendel 9

buyers can access inventories and services of multiple sellers via a host. In columns 9 and 10, Purcell's invention briefly describes the searching techniques to be used. Based on the description, at best, the buyer is capable of entering a "search criteria" wherein some of the fields may be specified by the buyer. Purcell does not describe a single search of a plurality of different items on different data sources.

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Claims 18 and 34 are allowable over Purcell and the corresponding rejection under 35 USC 102(b) should be withdrawn. Since Claims 19-33 and 35-37 depend from independent Claims 1 and 18, respectively, then for the same reasons set forth above with regard to Claims 1 and 18, these dependent claims are also allowable over Purcell and the corresponding rejections under 35 USC 102(b) should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, Purcell does not teach any of the claimed limitations of the dependent claims.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by
Johnson et al. (US 6,023,683)**

In paragraph 11 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 18-37 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Johnson et al. (US 6,023,683). Applicant has amended the claims to better clarify applicant's invention.

Johnson

Johnson is directed to a system that maintains a catalog database of a plurality of catalogs whereby a user can search multiple catalogs in the database. Appendix VII illustrates an exemplary search screen wherein the user can enter a page number, item, or part number, etc. in a catalog or catalogs as described in columns 9-12. Unlike Applicant's invention, Johnson allows a single item search in multiple catalogs of a centralized database.

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Claims 18 and 34 are allowable over Johnson and the corresponding rejection under 35 USC 102(b) should be withdrawn. Since Claims 19-33 and 35-37 depend from independent Claims 1 and 18, respectively, then for the same reasons set forth above with regard to Claims 1 and 18,

Pat. App. 09/833,956

Lin-Hendel 9


these dependent claims are also allowable over Johnson and the corresponding rejections under 35 USC 102(b) should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, Johnson does not teach any of the claimed limitations of the dependent claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, the Applicant believes that she has overcome all of the Examiner's basis for rejection, and that this application therefore stands in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner is of the opinion that such action can not be taken, the Applicant requests that he contact her undersigned attorney at (908) 654-8000 in order to resolve any outstanding issues without the necessity of issuing another Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,


Jean-Marc Zimmerman, Esq.
Reg. No. 36,978
226 St. Paul Street
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
Tel: (908) 654-8000

Dated: November 24, 2004
Westfield, New Jersey

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that on November 24, 2004 I caused an Amendment to U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/833,956 to be sent by facsimile to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.


Jean-Marc Zimmerman

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKewed/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.